APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/272,069	03/18/1999	DAVID I.J. GLEN	0100.9900340	5165

24228   7590   09/10/2002

MARKISON & RECKAMP, PC
PO BOX 06229
WACKER DR
CHICAGO, IL 60606-0229

EXAMINER
HARRISON, CHANTE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/272,069	Applicant(s) GLEN, DAVID I.J.
	Examiner Chante Harrison	Art Unit 2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 August 2002</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-9 and 14-18* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-9, 14 and 17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *15, 16 and 18* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4)☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment B, filed on 8/21/02.

This action is made FINAL.

2.   Claims 1-9 and 14-18 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6-9, 14 and 17 are

independent claims. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claims 10-13 and 19 have

been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-9, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Mukai, U.S. Patent 5,359,702, 10/1994, 345/600.

As per independent claim 1, Mukai discloses a plurality of lookup tables (FIG. 1

'44'; col. 6, II. 28-33), each table provides a set of output data in response to received

input (col. 6, II. 28 et seq.) and selecting output data in one of the tables (col. 6, II. 43 et

seq.).

As per dependent claim 2, Mukai discloses the tables include a pass through

function that provides the received input data as the set of output data (col. 5, II. 35 et

seq.).

As per dependent claim 3, Mukai discloses each of the plurality of tables stores a

plurality of set of output data (col. 6, II. 28-33), each set of output data corresponds to a

gamma correction curve for a corresponding gamma value of the plurality of gamma values (col. 6, ll. 28 et seq.), the correction curve maps values of the received input to output values (col. 5, ll. 20 et seq.).

As per dependent claim 4, Mukai discloses pixel data is provided as received input to each of the gamma correction tables (FIG. 1), the table selector comprising a mulitplexor (FIG. 1 '26') that receives the sets of output data from the plurality of gamma correction lookup tables (col. 7, ll. 45 et seq.), a set of output data is selected based on the gamma selection (col. 6, ll. 28 et seq.).

As per dependent claim 5, Mukai discloses the gamma correction tables are memory structures addressed by the received input data (col. 7, ll. 45 et seq.).

As per independent claim 6, Mukai discloses the tables storing plural gamma correction curves (col. 6, ll. 28-33), the plurality of sets of gamma corrected data includes data for each of the plurality of correction curves (col. 6, ll. 28 et seq.; FIG. 5a). The rejection as applied to independent claim 1 is included herein.

As per independent claim 7, Mukai discloses the table receives input signals that select a set of data from the table (col. 6, ll. 10-20, 28-34), the first portion of the signal selects a particular correction curve (col. 6, ll. 28-34) and the second portion of the signal selects the corrected data from the particular curve (col. 6, ll. 34 et seq.).

As per independent claim 8, Mukai discloses selecting output data in one of the

tables (col. 6, ll. 28 et seq.). The rejection as applied to claim 7 is included herein.

As per independent claim 9, Mukai discloses storing a plurality of precomputed

gamma corrected data sets corresponding to gamma curves (col. 5, ll. 55-56; col. 5-6, ll.

65-5) and selecting output data in one of the tables (col. 6, ll. 28 et seq.).

As per independent claim 14, Mukai discloses a frame buffer (FIG. 1 '38'). The

rejection as applied to independent claim 9 is included herein.

As per independent claim 17, Mukai discloses receiving pixel data (FIG. 1, '12').

The rejection as applied to independent claim 9 is included herein.

Claims 15-16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last

Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/02 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues Mukai fails to disclose "automatically [selecting]... output

data..." (p. 4, Para. 1).

Mukai discloses a user selecting a device that will be used to transmit a source

signal along with a control signal (col. 4, ll. 23-41) and a table setting unit that

automatically selects one of a plurality of gamma tables based on data in a control unit

that specifies that gamma information to be selected (col. 4-5, ll. 60-6).

Applicant argues Mukai fails to disclose "gamma selection information" (p. 4,

Para. 1).

Mukai discloses a control unit, which comprises various system data to

generate/select data based on input channel information that identifies a device that

specifies gamma selection information (col. 4-5, ll. 65-6).

With respect to Applicant's assertion (p. 5, Para. 1) that Mukai does not disclose

a multiplexor selecting output from sets of output, Mukai teaches selecting gamma

correcting tables that correspond to one of a plurality of devices. Therefore the function

of a multiplexor is inherent.

Applicant argues Mukai fails to teach "a selection block" (p. 5, Para. 3). Mukai

discloses generating a table of gamma data from information selected from gamma

table memory having a plurality of sets of gamma data relative to a plurality of devices.

Applicant argues (p. 6, Para. 1 & 2) that Mukai fails to teach an input signal

having a first portion that selects a gamma curve and a second portion for selecting the

gamma corrected data from the curve, but teaches using a control signal to indicate a

channel that has been activated.

Mukai teaches a user inputting a signal through a control panel, which is used to

identify a channel that designates a device and its corresponding gamma correction

data. The signal then passes to a control unit which enables the relative characteristic

data from the corresponding gamma correction data to be selected and applied to the

image signal source (col. 5, ll. 10-35).

Applicant argues (p. 7, Para. 1) that Mukai fails to disclose "selecting...gamma

corrected data from... pre-computed...data". Mukai teaches obtaining a set of gamma

data from a gamma correcting table memory having "pre-computed" gamma data (col.

4-5, ll. 65-6) that is relative to one of a plurality of devices.

With respect to Applicants traversal of Examiner's arguments in the previous Office Action, which related the selection of one of the plurality of devices having gamma characteristics to the claimed table selector, the above arguments more clearly identify Mukai's teachings of the claimed table selector.

3.		**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is (703) 305-3937.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600